



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,547	02/27/2002	David F. Bantz	YOR920010667US1	9848
35526	7590	01/26/2006		
DUKE. W. YEE YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER ZHEN, LI B	
			ART UNIT 2194	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 01/26/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/085,547

Applicant(s)

BANTZ ET AL.

Examiner

Li B. Zhen

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-47,49 and 50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-47,49 and 50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1,2,4-47,49 and 50 are pending in the application.
2. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 11/02/2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1,2,4-47,49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,327,551 to Peterson et al. [hereinafter referred**

to as Peterson] in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0055919 to Fong et al. [hereinafter referred to as Fong].

5. As to claim 1, Peterson teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for loading software onto a computer [col. 1, lines 5 – 8], the method comprising the steps:

receiving software requirements [software requirements are documented in the form of a usage requirement specification; col. 1, line 63 – col. 2, line 12] from a plurality of users [specification is an expression of the market opportunity in terms of the expected users goals, constraints imposed by users; col. 1, line 63 – col. 2, line 12];

determining (a) a plurality of software components [components are functions and objects; col. 15, lines 29 – 41] that will fulfill the software requirements while addressing constraints and affinities between said plurality of software components [functional specification is produced from the requirements specification by means of a mapping from the requirements specification using or reusing components from the functional layer (these components are functions and objects); col. 15, lines 29 – 41] and (b) a respective plurality of configuration options that reflect current best practices with regard to said plurality of software components [determination of software requirements followed by validation; col. 6, lines 1 – 17 and col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 16]. Peterson teaches a service packages [col. 13, lines 50 – 51] but does not teach generating a disk image containing said plurality software components configured according to said respective plurality of configuration options.

However, Fong teaches deployment of data processing systems with a specific set of software under the centralized control of a graphical user interface [p. 1-2, paragraph 0013] and generating a disk image [an automatic image capture of all hardware configurations and images from the selected reference data processing system; p. 8, paragraph 0055] containing said plurality software components configured according to said respective plurality of configuration options [user enters image capture information (e.g., name, description, and destination for the image) about data processing system; p. 8, paragraph 0055].

6. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of generating a disk image containing said plurality software components configured according to said respective plurality of configuration options as taught by Fong to the invention of Peterson because this allow an administrator to take a snapshot of an operating system configuration for a computer, including: base disk image, application packages, configuration settings, and specific hardware configurations [p. 1, paragraph 0008 of Fong]. This is driven from a central database containing unique parameters for each computer, including the rules that decide which images and software are applied to each computer [p. 1, paragraph 0008 of Fong].

7. As to claim 2, Peterson as modified teaches wherein said determining step applies rules to the software requirements to identify software components that comply with the software requirements [Rule-Based Deployment rules can be maintained in the

database for Deployment automatic deployment of hardware configurations or images;
p. 6, Table 6 of Fong].

8. As to claim 4, Peterson as modified teaches wherein the rules include rules mapping a software requirement into a corresponding software component [col. 7, lines 25 – 34 of Peterson].

9. As to claim 5, Peterson as modified teaches wherein the rules include rules specifying when particular versions of a particular software component are to be utilized [col. 1, lines 37 – 43 of Peterson].

10. As to claim 6, Peterson as modified teaches wherein the rules include rules specifying installation options regarding a particular software component [p. 4, paragraph 0038 of Fong].

11. As to claim 7, Peterson as modified teaches wherein the rules include rules specifying how to test a particular software component [validation or testing process; col. 5, line 60 – col. 6, line 17 of Peterson].

12. As to claim 8, Peterson as modified teaches testing the disk image [p. 2, paragraph 0032 of Fong].

13. As to claim 9, Peterson as modified teaches wherein testing the disk image includes verifying that said plurality of software components complies with the software requirements" [col. 7, lines 8 – 17 of Peterson].

14. As to claim 10, Peterson as modified teaches wherein testing the disk image includes verifying that said plurality of software components complies with at least one rule [p. 8, lines 0054 of Fong].

15. As to claim 11, Peterson as modified teaches generating a difference image that represents differences between the disk image and another existing disk image, whereby the another existing disk image may be updated to match the disk image by applying the difference image to the another existing disk image [p. 3, paragraph 0036 of Fong].

16. As to claim 12, Peterson as modified teaches the software requirements are received through a network that includes the Internet [p. 2, paragraph 0031 of Fong].

17. As to claim 13, Peterson as modified teaches wherein the software requirements can be received in terms of customer needs rather than specific software components [col. 1, line 63 – col. 2, line 12 of Peterson].

18. As to claim 14, Peterson as modified teaches the requirements are represented in a structured format [step entails the decomposition of user goals generated by the requirement specification 1 to a structure or hierarchy; col. 9, lines 48 – 56 of Peterson].

19. As to claim 15, Peterson as modified teaches the structured format is Extensible Markup Language (XML) [Possible file formats include CSV, tab-delimited, Excel Spreadsheet, HTML, and XML; p. 7, Table 7 of Fong].

20. As to claim 49, Peterson as modified teaches storing said disk image on a computer-readable and distributing said computer-readable [p. 2, paragraph 0016 of Fong] media to a client [p. 5, paragraph 0040 of Fong].

21. As to claim 16, Peterson as modified teaches a method for creating a customized disk image for loading software onto a computer, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps:

parsing a plurality of inputs regarding a desired system to extract specifications regarding software [col. 6, lines 22 – 50 of Peterson];

evaluating a plurality of rules with respect to the plurality of inputs to derive a set of software components conforming to the specifications [Rule-Based Deployment rules can be maintained in the database for Deployment automatic deployment of hardware configurations or images; p. 6, Table 6 of Fong];

evaluating a second plurality of rules with respect to the plurality of inputs to derive a set of configuration options conforming to at least the specifications" [p. 6, paragraph 0046 of Fong];

storing each software component from the set of software components on a storage device [col. 27, lines 39 – 54 of Peterson];

configuring each software component stored on the storage device in accordance to the set of configuration options" [col. 6, lines 1 – 17 and col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 16 of Peterson]; and

generating a disk image from contents of the storage device [an automatic image capture of all hardware configurations and images from the selected reference data processing system; p. 8, paragraph 0055 of Fong].

22. As to claim 17, Peterson as modified teaches the inputs are requests from hypertext browsers [Web browser on a workstation 118; p. 3, paragraph 0033 of Fong].

23. As to claim 18, Peterson as modified teaches the inputs are XML documents [Possible file formats include CSV, tab-delimited, Excel Spreadsheet, HTML, and XML; p. 7, Table 7 of Fong].

24. As to claim 19, is the computer-readable medium claim corresponding to the method claim 1 and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

25. As to claim 20, the rejection of claim 19 are incorporated and are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 2 above.

26. As to claim 21, Peterson as modified teaches wherein the rules are stored in a database [Rule-Based Grouping rules can be maintained in the deployment Grouping database; p. 6, Table 6 of Fong].

27. As to claims 22-32, the rejection of claim 21 are incorporated and are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 4-14 respectfully.

28. As to claim 33, this is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 15.

29. As to claim 34, is the data processing system claim corresponding to the method claim 1 and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

30. As to claim 35, the rejection of claim 34 are incorporated and are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 2 above.

Art Unit: 2194

31. As to claim 36, Peterson as modified teaches wherein the rules are stored in a database [Rule-Based Grouping rules can be maintained in the deployment Grouping database; p. 6, Table 6 of Fong].

32. As to claims 37-47, the rejection of claim 36 are incorporated and are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 4-14 respectfully.

33. As to claim 50, this is data processing system claim that corresponds to method claim 49. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as to claim 49 above.

Conclusion

34. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6,269,473 to Freed et al. teaches a software modeling environment that supports the development and execution of software that can be dynamically configured.

U.S. Patent No. 5,950,011 to Albrecht et al. teaches a system for configuring preconfigured software in networked open systems in a distributed environment.

U.S. Patent No. 6,330,005 to Tonelli et al. teaches a method of designing a network.

CONTACT INFORMATION

35. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li B. Zhen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3768. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on 571-272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Li B. Zhen
Examiner
Art Unit 2194

lbz


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER